

Amendments to the Drawings:

Attached are five sheets of drawings that include changes to Figures 6B, 14, 22B, and 22C. These sheets replace the original four sheets that included Figures 6B, 14, 22B, and 22C. The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the amended drawings.

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pedersen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,705). In this Amendment, claims 24 and 25 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-25 will be pending after entry of this Amendment.

I. Amendment to the Specification and Drawings

In this Amendment, Applicants have removed embedded hyperlinks and corrected four typographical errors in the drawings and three typographical errors in the specification. No new matter had been added, as all the corrections are supported by the discussion in the specification and by the illustrations in the figures. Specifically, Applicants moved a “From 615” transitional arrow that previously pointed to operation 660 in the flowchart illustrated in Figure 6B to now point to the operation 655. This change is supported by (1) the referenced transition from 615 to 655 in Figure 6A, (2) the discussion in the specification on page 34, lines 5-7, and (3) the discussion in the specification on page 34, lines 8-22, which provides the rationale as to why the process 600 of Figure 6 transitions to 655 from 615 and 645.

Applicants also corrected the description of the operation 1445 in Figure 14. This correction is supported by the description in the specification on page 51, lines 15-17. In addition, Applicants added a “From 2242” transitional arrow to operation 2228 on Figure 22B. This correction is supported by the description in the specification on page 72, lines 14-15. Applicants also corrected the numbering of operation 2246 in Figure 22C. This correction is supported by the description in the specification on page 72, lines 19-20.

In the specification on page 31, Applicants changed an inaccurate reference to a transition from 615 to 660 in Figure 6B, to an accurate reference regarding a transition from 615 to 655. As

mentioned above, this change is supported by (1) the referenced transition from 615 to 655 in Figure 6A, (2) the discussion in the specification on page 34, lines 5-7, and (3) the discussion in the specification on page 34, lines 8-22, which provides the rationale as to why the process 600 of Figure 6 transitions to 655 from 615 and 645.

On page 72, line 13, Applicants have also changed "2242" to "2202." This is a reference number for the operation that the process 2200 of Figures 22A-22C performs to generate several graphs. As mentioned in the specification on page 65, line 1 to page 66, line 16, the process 2200 generates these graphs at 2202. *See also* page 70, lines 15-17. Finally, on page 73, lines 2-3, Applicants have changed "[a]fter 2244, the process ends," to "[a]fter 2246, the process ends." As shown in Figure 22C, the process 2200 ends after it completes the database tables; as specified in the specification, the process 2200 completes the database tables at 2246, which proceeds 2244 in Figure 22C. *See* page 72, lines 19-20.

II.Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-23 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pedersen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,705, hereinafter Pedersen). Independent claims 1, 2, and 12 have been amended and as the rejections may be applied to amended claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse.

Amended claim 1 recites a data storage structure that stores a plurality of sub-networks, wherein each sub-network performs a set of output functions, wherein each sub-network comprises a set of circuit elements and at least some of the sub-networks comprise a first circuit having a first output outside the sub-network and a second circuit having a second output outside the sub-network, wherein the first circuit receives a direct or indirect input from the second

circuit, wherein each sub-network is stored based on a set of indices derived from the set of output functions performed by the sub-network.

Pedersen does not teach or suggest each recited feature of claim 1. For example, Pedersen does not teach or suggest a data storage structure storing sub-networks comprising a first circuit having a first output outside the sub-network and a second circuit having a second output outside the sub-network where the first circuit receives a direct or indirect input from the second circuit. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner cite the portion(s) of Pedersen that disclose storage of a sub-network comprising 1) a first circuit having a first output outside the sub-network, 2) a second circuit having a second output outside the sub-network, 3) the first circuit receiving a direct or indirect input from the second circuit, and 4) storage of such the sub-network based on a set of indices derived from the set of output functions performed by the sub-network.

As such, Applicants submit that Pedersen does not teach or suggest each limitation of claim 1 and that claim 1 is in allowable form. Claim 2 is an independent claim containing the “first and second circuit” limitations of claim 1. Claims 3-11 are dependent on claim 2 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 2. Claim 12 is an independent claim containing the “first and second circuit” limitations of claim 1. Claims 13-23 are dependent on claim 12 and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

III. New Claims 24 and 25

In this Amendment, Applicants have added claims 24 and 25. New claim 25 recites the data storage structure of claim 2 wherein:

at least some sub-networks perform at least three output functions.

New claim 25 is dependent on claim 2 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 2. New claim 24 recites limitations similar to new claim 25 but is dependent on claim 12 and allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 12. Further, Pedersen does not disclose, teach, or even suggest each recited feature of new claims 24 and 25.

IV. Information Disclosure Statement

Accompanying this Amendment is a copy of an Electronic Information Disclosure Statement that Applicants are submitting concurrently with but separately from this Amendment. This Information Disclosure Statement lists an additional reference for the Examiner's consideration. The Examiner is requested to make this document of record.


CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing remarks, Applicants believe that the rejections and objections in the Office Action of December 15, 2004 are fully overcome and that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions regarding the case, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

STATTLER, JOHANSEN & ADELI LLP

Dated: 3/22/05



Gregory Suh
Reg. No. 48,187

Stattler Johansen & Adeli LLP
PO Box 51860
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0728
Phone: (650) 752-0990 ext.104
Fax: (650) 752-0995